

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the official action dated September 22, 2006. The claim amendments included herein are merely clarifying amendments and are not meant to change the intended scope of the claims. Thus, the amendments present the rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal, and they should be entered in due course. Moreover, the amendments are manifest, requiring only a cursory review by the Examiner, thereby providing additional ground for their entry.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 12-16, 18-22, 24-26, and 28 were pending in the application. In the official action, claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 12-16, 18-22, 24-26, and 28 were rejected. In this Amendment, claims 3, 4, and 28 have been canceled, and claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 20, 22, 25, and 26 have been amended. Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 10, 12-16, 18-22, and 24-26 thus remain for consideration.

Applicants submit that claims 1, 5-7, 9, 10, 12-16, 18-22, and 24-26 are in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

\$103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12-16, 18-20, 22, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Daley (U.S. Patent No. 4,491,690) in view of Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0217123).

Claims 4, 5, 21, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Daley in view of Anderson as applied to claims 3, 20, and 26, and further in view of Joao (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0121969).

Claims 3, 4, and 28 have been canceled, thereby rendering their rejections moot.

Applicants submit that the independent claims (claims 1, 7, 10, 13-16, 20, 22, 25, and 26) are patentable over Daley, Anderson and Joao.

Applicants' invention as recited in the independent claims directed toward information transmission and/or reception. Each of the claims recites that "predetermined information" is stored in a transmitter/receiver, and that a "piece" of the predetermined information is transmitted/received via the transmission/reception of a number of calling signals. The predetermined information is "appliance operation data for operating at least one household appliance [in communication with a reception system], and wherein, for each such appliance, the appliance operation data is indicative of the appliance's type and at least one operation of the appliance." Each of the claims further recites that:

the [reception system] identifies one of the household appliances and one operation of the identified appliance based on [retrieved information] and operates the identified appliance according to the identified operation;

the [reception system] detects whether or not the operated appliance has functioned properly and provides an indication to the [transmission system] of whether or not the operated appliance has functioned properly;

when the [reception system] detects that the operated appliance has functioned properly, the [reception system] transmits to the [transmission system] a first number of calling signals indicating that the operated appliance has functioned properly; and

when the [reception system] detects that the operated appliance has not functioned properly, the [reception

system] transmits to the [transmission system] a second number of calling signals indicating that the operated appliance has not functioned properly.

Supporting disclosure for Applicants' scheme of notifying the transmission system as to whether or not an operated appliance has functioned properly can be found in the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0151] and [0152].

Neither Daley, Anderson nor Joao discloses Applicants' scheme of notifying the transmission system as to whether or not an operated appliance has functioned properly. Accordingly, Applicants believe that claims 1, 7, 10, 13-16, 20, 22, 25, and 26 are patentable over Daley, Anderson and Joao - taken either alone or in combination - on at least this basis.

Further, since dependent claims inherit the limitations of their respective base claims, Applicants believe that dependent claims 5, 6, 9, 12, 18, 19, 21, and 24 are patentable over Daley, Anderson and Joao for at least the same reasons as discussed in connection with the independent claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to telephone the undersigned at (908) 654-5000.

Application No.: 10/632,783

Docket No.: SCEI 3.0-133 CIP

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 12-1095.

The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Dated: December 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Bruno Polito

Registration No.: 38,580  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

699643\_1.DOC